Abstract of Vol.5, Nov.1988

Abstract of Vol.5, Nov.1988. 西洋古典論集 1988, 5: 99-111

ISSUE DATE:
1988-11-30

URL:
http://hdl.handle.net/2433/68565

SUMMARIES

⟨xeinos⟩ in Homer----(2)

Hideyo NEMOTO

In the preceding paper (⟨xeinos⟩ in Homer----(1)) I observed that "xeinos" in the Il. signifies A) "stranger, outlander", B) "guest", C) "one in guestfriendship" and D) "host", which holds true in the Od. as well. Though Homer uses words like "allognotos" "allodapos", "allothroos" and "allotrios", all meaning "outlander", approximately two-thirds of all the examples of "xeinos" in the Od. are used in the sense of A). But why does Homer prefer the word "xeinos"? Because "xeinos" has, at its core, the conceptional meaning of "a person not belonging to the same society as the speaker", which derivatives from "allo-" do not possess.

"xeinos" has, by usage, at least three different levels to the meaning of "stranger, outlander".

1) As in 4.26, where only the fact that two outsiders have arrived is reported to Menelaos; this usage could be called "neutral", where the outlanders are recognized merely as unknown people, without either prejudice or favour (cf. 4.28ff.).

2) In 1.119ff., Telemachos finds a foreigner (Athene-Mentes) standing in front of his door, welcomes and shows him careful consideration (cf. 1.133ff.). This attitude toward the foreigner reveals the norm of ethics generally accepted in Homeric society (cf.

14.402ff.), as seen in the expression "Zeus xeinios". Further examples can be found in the cases of Peisistratos, Eumaios and the Phaeacian nobles, who show their favour to foreigners before they are accepted as guests. "xeinos" in these contexts connotes a "positive" nuance.

It should be noted, however, that 1) often developes into 2), as in the cases of Nausicaa in Book 6, of Arete in Book 7, who opens her lips only after a long silence, having judged Odysseus' personality from his speech, and of Penelope who in spite of her previous disappointment at false reports (cf. 19.309ff., 350ff.) dares to test Odysseus the beggar before accepting him as a guest (19.318ff.).

3) A distinctively "negative" attitude toward foreigners is to be discerned in the episodes of Polyphemos in Book 9 and of the Laistrygones in Book 10, both of whom maltreat and devour foreign outlanders: but the former is described as "athemistos" and without either "agora" or "agriculture" or "any means of communication with the outer world", while the latter live, so to speak, at the end of the world. To the audience of the epic the rude behaviour of such monsters must have been, in a sense, acceptable as characteristic of savages who lead lives far from civilized society. As to Penelope's suitors and their hangers-on, no excuse can be found for their attitudes toward Odysseus the beggar, for which they must pay with their lives.

In their repeated maltreatment of the beggar (Antinoos' 17.375f., 446ff., 462ff., Eurymachos' 18.351ff., 357ff., 389ff., Melanthios' 17.372ff., 29.178f., Melantho's 18.327, 19.65f.) can be seen the "Steigerung" which intensifies not only the anger of the hero

but also the resentment of the audience, leading in the end to the denouement of the hero's revenge upon his enemies in his homeland as well as to "katharsis" for the audience. Note should be taken of the fact that "positive" or "negative" attitudes toward foreign outlanders functioned also as a sign of "good" or "bad" characters to the Homeric audience, who did not read but listened.

Though a word of Eumaios (17.382f.) dimly betrays the presence of unwelcoming feelings toward foreigners, the ideal of the belief in "Zeus xeinios" is made a point of elsewhere in the poem. This reminds us of Plato's description of Homer as "the educator of Greece" (Rep. 606E), for education is a belief in the realization of an ideal.

Aristophanes' Wit
--On Ranae 1378-1410-- (1)

Tadatoshi KUBOTA

The comical effects in the verse-weighing scene (1378-1410) can be easily appreciated without any knowledge of the tragedies. To understand the scene's implications to the full, however, the complicated devices and techniques here employed by the versatile poet should be analysed in detail.

The first comparison assumes the form of a kind of riddle. Dionysos gives a ridiculous and nonsensical solution made up of sur-

prisingly unexpected associations of the various visions. The point of his wit lies in the queer and unintelligible expression that "eriopolikos hygron poesas tupos hospertaria" (like wool-sellers he made the word as wet as wool)(1386-87). While the successive associations are stirred up among the words--river, water, scale of Zeus, that of the cheese-seller, Golden Fleece in Medeia and the end of the sentence permits convergence upon the figure, familiar in the Agora, of a cunning wool-seller wetting his wool to make it heavier. The ambiguity of the meaning of "hygros" (wet, moist etc.) in this context also allows us to think of various associations welling up from the great variety of its usages. One of them may suggest that "hygros" has something to do with the tears of Philoktetes lamenting his situation. In Euripides' case "diaptastai" (to fly through) evokes the imagery of flying which reminds us of "skaphos epteromenon" (winged ship) and it is substituted for "epos epteromenon" (winged word) through association with the Homeric phrase "epea pteroenta" (winged word) because of the similarity of their meaning and sound. Here the double-entendre of "pteroo" (to furnish with wings / to agitate) is also exploited for "epos epteromenon". Though it apparently signifies "winged word", it darkly hints at the other meaning "agitated word", which is intended as a brief comment suitable to the speech of Medeia's nurse. Therefore through his absurd speech Dionysos (=the poet) offers his implicit criticisms of the cited verses.

As well, weight of the verses depends on the visions concerning wetness and something winged, produced through associations based on the word-play. The literary tradition since Homer, the traditional diction and multiplicity of meaning of a word or phrase make it pos-

sible to build up such imageries.

In the second round, where Thanatos and Peitho are compared, the attributes of the gods and the conception of both words as common nouns contribute to the feeling of heaviness. While the double-entendre of "barys" (heavy / unbearable) is applied to "Thanatos" (death) on the basis of the traditional view of death, "kuphos" (light) is introduced as the antonym of "barys" to describe the character of "Peitho" (persuation). The phrase "kuphon kai nun uk ekhon" (light and having no sense), implying a scathing criticism of Euripides' quotation, seems at the same time to suggest the compound word "kuphonun", which casts a coarse joke at the goddess as a sort of hetaira or prostitute who is "kophonus" (light-hearted / light-minded). The simple but ambiguous speech of Dionysos "karteron ti kai mega" (1398) recalls various associations, given the wide range of meaning of "karteros" and "megas". For example, when Dionysos says "bebleke" (he has thrown), we expect that "karteron ti" indicates something solid as the object of "bebleke", but when he continues "Akhilleus ...", our expectation is betrayed and we are inclined to suppose that "karteros" (mighty) is an epithet for Akhilleus, as with Herakles in "karteros ho Herakles" (Ranae 464). Euripides tries to meet the requirement of Dionysos by citing the verse, including the word "siderobrithes" (loaded with iron), which is composed of sideros and britho: sideros (iron) is the most adamant (kraterotatos), according to Hesiodos, and "brithes" is a derivative of "britho" (to be heavy). But Dionysos decides that Aiskhylos' verse is heavier than that of Euripides because the physical weight of the materials denoted by the words in the quoted verse is regarded as the weight of that verse. Thus at each com-

parison Dionysos so arbitrarily shifts the criterion of his judgment that he can easily deceive Euripides; that is, the poet contrives laboriously and comically to challenge the audience's anticipation and imagination.

Virgil's Georgics
--A mission for a man living in civilization--

Taro YAMASHITA

It is well recognized that civilization is one of the main themes of the Georgics. This paper, paying attention to two key words in the Georgics, labor and amor, examine how Virgil treats this theme.

In the first 'digression' (1.118-159), man's labor is religiously justified, for Virgil suggests that labor alone should cause Jupiter's will to be realized on earth. In the Georgics, labor can be taken as cooperation with a benevolent divinity, rather than as mere hard work. We should also note that Virgil shows us two paradigms of civilized society which man could bring about; the civil war in the epilogue of Book 1 (1.463-514) is a negative example, while 'Praise of Italy' (2.136-176) may give us a positive one. This sharp contrast might suggest that man's control of inner nature should be the decisive element in determining the characteristic of society.

Corresponding to these opposite descriptions of society, two 'digressions' deal with amor from a contrasting view; 3.209-283 shows a negative force of amor, which as blind love passion compels each animal to death, while 2.315-345 displays a positive one, where amor symbolizes the power of reproduction, without which no animals could continue in existence.

In light of this contrast, we may understand that the work of rearing cattle (the theme of Book 3) is fundamentally close to that of growing crops and plants (the theme of Books 1 and 2), because in each work man is required to find out the best way of controlling or making use of natural energy, which lies both inside and outside the animals.

Like the animals, man has his amor, which he must control creatively. In fact, analysis of the examples of amor in the Georgics might show that Virgil regards man's amor as his inner energy to create various activities, both constructive and destructive.

In this respect, Virgil's idea is quite different from that of Lucretius, because for the latter any passion may be the cause of worry and trouble. In the so-called 'Praise of the country life' (2.458-542), Virgil compares a happy farmer with a happy philosopher who represents this Epicurean view. Virgil's farmer, who as here interpreted, controls his amor creatively, lives in harmony with nature, his labor being described as a positive factor in sustaining not only his family but also his country as a whole. The philosopher, on the other hand, is happy because he has nothing to fear or care for. We may understand, however, that this philosopher lacks the vigor (positive amor) to engage in any kind of constructive labor.

But here in the 'Praise of the country life', we find another contrast; that is, between the happy farmer and a city dweller who eagerly seeks wealth and fame. The latter is bitterly criticized, for he only indulges in consumption and doesn't produce anything good for society. In short, he lives for the sake of himself, and in this respect, can be compared with the Epicurean philosopher. But as this city dweller is full of passion to acquire wealth and fame, he may also be close to the 'greedy farmer' (auari agricolae, 1.47-48). Yet we can deny such similarity, for the farmer's amor and that of the city dweller are quite oppositely directed; the farmer's labor, driven by his positive amor, will always harmonize itself with Jupiter's will, while any activity of the city dweller, driven out of control by amor and motivated by what we call 'egoism', will bring about conflict and ultimately civil war.

It is interesting that this criticism of the city dweller is made with such expressions as are found in the work of Lucretius. This means, I think, that Virgil intends to emphasize his original point of view on amor and labor. What are we to think then of the epilogue of Book 3, a tragic description of disaster in the animal world, which also reflects Lucretious' description of the plague at Athens (D.R.N. 6.1138f.)? This suggests the theme of fear of death. As we have seen, the philosopher in the 'Praise of the country life' is said to have attained happiness because he has dispelled the fear of death, while the farmer is happy because he knows the rural gods (2.490-494). Does this comparison imply that Virgil has shown us his original view of the fear of death in the Georgics? Or should the farmer be tormented by fear of the death he cannot avoid?

I have pointed out that Virgil's farmer lives for the sake of

others and contribites to civilization, which will develop forever. If the farmer's labor always finds itself going in the direction Jupiter has set before him, it is because his labor is prompted by such amor as is well controlled in conformance to Jupiter's will. Virgil's farmer, for whom the walls of the ego will recede, will not suffer from fear of death, since the things he cares for will continue and be motivated by divine will.

In light of this interpretation of everlasting life, the deification of Augustus can be easily understood. He is promised deification, because he has brought peace to all the world, and has set a foundation for Rome's perpetual growth and development. Through his own labor Augustus has set the best example for every citizen of Rome who seeks to perform his mission in his own way. In the Georgics, as here understood, Virgil has given a religious explanation for man's role and mission in Rome, the most highly civilized nation.

Horace c. 4. 8 and c. 4. 9
--poetry and virtue-- (1)

Tsutomu IWASAKI

Both c. 4. 8 and c. 4. 9 refer to virtue, when they declare immortality that poetry can grant to its subjects. We attempt to comprehend the relation between poetry and virtue which is showed in the

two poems. This paper deals with c. 4. 8 and is the first part of our study on both poems.

In a 'priamel' of 1-12, we recognize the following aspects. First, the characteristic of expressing the internal and spiritual which poetry has is suggestedby contrast with other artistic productions such as pictures and statues. Secondly, here, a poem is the present which a poet makes to his friends (sodalibus 2), and its giver and receiver form a pair (non ... mihi ..., non tibi ... 9 / gaudes carminibus; carmina possumus 11). Thirdly, in 9-10 (non tibi talium / res est aut animus deliciarum egens), we find the poet's ethical choice of the men whom he wants to praise in his song.

These aspects are developed in the second part of the poem. In 13-29, poetry is now compared to the inscriptions which describe the achievements of great commands matter-of-factly. In 21-34, the poet refers to the virtues of those whom poetry made immortal (meritis 24 ----virtus 26----virum 28 / impiger 30----eripiunt 32----vota bonos ducit ad exitus 34). Especially, Hercules, Tyndaridae and Liber appear also in c. 3. 3 where the main theme is virtue. virtus (26) must mean that of Aeacus, not of poets (vatum 27); therefore, we can say that a hero's virtue and a poet's praise (favor et lingua 26) as a pair bring immortality.

As mentioned above, c. 4. 8 shows that poetry is firmly connected with virtue and that virtue is indispensable when poetry displays its ability to immortalize.

Livy's Ideology and the Peculiarity of Book I of AB URBE CONDITA

Takuo NISHIDA

Certainty as to Livy's ideplogy and attitude toward the Roman Civil War and policies of Augustus is a difficult matter, given the fact that the latter part of his work, in which the civil war might have been written, is lost; however, the presence of Book I seems to be very significant, judging from the following facts:

1. Livy is thought to have begun to compose Book I about three years after the naval battle of Actium, when the historian still had clearly in mind the misery and bloodiness of the civil war and entertained intense ideological thoughts as 'a last republican', paying careful attention to Augustus' rule.

2. R. Syme maintains that Livy wrote his Praefatio about 27 B.C., probably after the completion of Books I-V, as an introduction to the first instalment of the work. According to the view of Bayet, Book I was at first separately written and published apart from the other books of the first Pentade, which means that Book I has a uniqueness and independence which can not be found in the other books.

3. Book I has no main theme, as do the other books in the first Pentade, but consists of many episodes concerning old Roman legends and the reigns of seven Roman kings.

Consequently the following matters are brought into question in this paper: first, the relation between the ideology of Livy and

the content or structure of Book I; secondly the pecuriality stemming from this relation.

With the intention of clarifying the relationship and solving the problems, focus should be on the inklings and insinuations of the historical events coeval with Livy, who probably described them in Book I. For example:

In the year 29 B.C. Augustus decreased the size of the senate by removing from it one hundred and ninety senators, later preferring to transact official business and often sit in with senators privately rather than refer official affairs to them--so wrote Dio Cassius; Livy, speaking of Tarquinius Superbus, says (I,49,6-7) that he adopted the same policy as Augustus so that senatorial rank would be given less respect, owing to the small number of senators.

Next example: Julius Caesar was assassinated by some senators and deified after his death, which reminds us of the death and deification of Romulus. In his description of Romulus' end, Livy believes that some people secretly insisted that king Romulus had been torn to pieces by the senators.

And next: Livia, whose father and husband fought together with the Republicans at Philippi and fell there in battle, can be considered to have defiled pietas to relatives by marrying Octavianus despite being in the sixth month of pregnancy. So Livia is similar to Tullia, daughter of the sixth Roman king, Servius Tullius, as regards the profanation of its pietas, for Tullia also killed her first husband and helped kill her father king.

Why do these allusions become critical matter in Book I? Because they have profound bearing on the peculiarity of this book; those who inquire fully into its content and structure become aware

of a kind of asymmetry, and oddness that is not seen in the other books.

Of the seven Roman kings the reigns of Romulus, Tullus Hostilius, Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus are described in more detail than those of Numa, Ancus, and Tarquinius Priscus. Omitting, however, the episode of the duel of the three Horatii, which has nothing to do with Livy's ideology, it can be said that Livy focuses on the three kings Romulus, Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus because their reigns presented many good opportunities to allude to the policy of Augustus and to events contemporary or near-contemporary with Livy.

Considering these points, I infer that the political ideology of the historian, that is, republicanism, exerted strong influence on the structure of Book I, resulting in an asymmetrical appearance, including numerous small episodes, but no main theme.

Ultimately, instead of the annalistic form, Livy introduced his own ideology into Book I.

These considerations show that Livy was opposed to Augustus, insofar as ideology is concerned, and his republicanism was more deeply rooted than is commonly believed, even if superficial reversion to a republican past was at that time a fashion and Livy's birthplace, Patavium, a haunt of republicans throughout the Roman Revolution.

On the other hand Livy was, as Tacitus has said, on friendly terms with Augustus in other respects.